

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/864,696	05/24/2001	Thomas E. Creamer	6169-224	1725

7590 08/13/2004

Gregory A. Nelson  
Akerman Senterfitt  
222 Lakeview Avenue, Fourth Floor  
P.O. Box 3188  
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188

EXAMINER

COFFY, EMMANUEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2157

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/864,696	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CREAMER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Emmanuel Coffy	<b>Art Unit</b> 2157	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 May 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some    \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the application filed on 24 May 2001. Claims 1-23 are pending. Claims 1-23 are directed to a method for a "Server Program Interface to Service Logic Execution Environment."

### Specification

2 The disclosure at line 10, page 7 states: "The service wrapper can include a service interface for publishing an interface to the service wrapper." This sentence requires clarification.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claimed limitation of "the service wrapper further comprising a service interface for publishing an interface to said service wrapper" is vague and unclear. However, to expedite a complete examination of the instant application claim 4 is understood as "the service wrapper further comprising a service interface for publishing an interface to said IESC".

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 102:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless-

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-23 directed to an advanced intelligent network, method and software are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Lee et al. (US 6,480,890).

Lee teaches a web interface to a service creation environment which includes a service logic parser adapted to receive a service logic description from the service creation environment, parse the service logic description and generate a web browser readable service data file. (See abstract)

Claim 1:

Referring to claim 1, Lee teaches an advanced intelligent network comprising: (See Fig. 1)

a service logic execution environment (SLEE), said SLEE comprising an event handler for routing messages between and among client components and service components; (See col. 1, lines 49-59).

at least one service component configured to post and receive messages to and from other service components in said SLEE through said event handler; and (See col. 1, lines 49-52).

at least one Internet enabled service component (IESC) executing in said SLEE, said IESC configured to post and receive messages to and from other service components in said SLEE through said event handler, said IESC communicatively linked to a server side program external to said SLEE. (See col. 3, lines 19-27).

Claim 2:

Referring to claim 2, Lee teaches a telephony environment having a service logic execution environment (SLEE), an Internet enabled service component (IESC) for use with the SLEE, said IESC comprising: (See Fig. 1 and Fig. 2).

at least one client service instance, each said client service instance corresponding to an Internet service application; and (See col. 4, lines 39-44).

a service wrapper, said service wrapper providing a common interface to said at least one client service instance for routing events between the SLEE and said at least one client service instance. (See col. 4, lines 44-54).

Claim 3:

Referring to claim 3, Lee teaches the IESC of claim 2, said service wrapper further comprising a deployment descriptor for providing configuration information to the SLEE. (See col. 4, lines 59-63).

Claim 4:

Referring to claim 4, Lee teaches the IESC of claim 2, said service wrapper further comprising a service interface for publishing an interface to said service wrapper. (See col. 4, lines 39-54).

Claim 6:

Referring to claim 6, Lee teaches the IESC of claim 2, said at least one client service instance further comprising a content interface for publishing an interface to said client service instance. (See col. 5, lines 58-61).

Claim 7:

Referring to claim 6, Lee teaches the IESC of claim 2, wherein said IESC interacts with other generic service components, external applications, service components, or protocol stacks. (See Fig.1 (10, 14) and Fig. 2 (23, 21, 24, 50, 22). (See col. 3, lines 17-27 and col. 2, lines 39-45).

Claim 11:

Referring to claim 11, Lee teaches the method of claim 10, further comprising: posting a second event to the SLEE responsive to said interaction between said client service instance and said Internet service application, said second event corresponding to said interaction. (See Fig. 3 (83) event 1 -> time; event 2 -> destination).

Claim 13:

Referring to claim 13, Lee teaches the method of claim 8, wherein said first event is from a generic service component. (See col. 5, lines 41-43).

Claims 8-10 and 14-23

These claims do not teach or define any significantly new limitations above and beyond claims 1-4, 6-11 and 13 to warrant particular treatment, and therefore, are rejected for similar reasons.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 5 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee Jr. et al. (US '890) in view of Tschirhart et al. (US 6,178,438.)

Lee Jr. teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a web interface to a service creation environment which includes a service logic parser adapted to receive a service logic description from the service creation environment, parse the service logic description and generate a web browser readable service data file. (See abstract).

Claim 5 and 12:

Referring to claim 5, it recites the IESC of claim 2, said service wrapper further comprising a protocol stack for managing communications in the telephony environment.

Lee Jr. teaches a service wrapper at col. 4, lines 44-54. Lee Jr. does explicitly suggest a protocol stack for managing communications in the telephony environment. However, Tschirhart teaches such a protocol. (See Fig. 3 and col. 3, lines 41-50).

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to use the service wrapper taught by Lee Jr. with a protocol stack in a telephony environment as disclosed by Tschirhart.



This system can be tailored to a proprietary protocol or an open protocol for that matter. Thus, claim 5 is rejected.

Claim 12 recites the same limitation is therefore rejected for the same reason.

### **Conclusion**

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Whitehead et al. (U.S. 6,085,030) teaches "Network Component Server."
- Yagel et al. (U.S. 6,324,275) teaches "System and Method for Total Telecommunications Service Commissioning."

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emmanuel Coffy whose telephone number is (703) 305-0325. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00 P.M.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (703) 308-7562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Emmanuel Coffy  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2157

\*\*\*

EC  
August 3rd, 2004



SALEH NAJJAR  
PRIMARY EXAMINER